

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

By this amendment, claims 1-18 and 20-24 are pending, claims 1, 5, 8, 11, 12, 14-16 and 20-22 having been amended, and claim 19 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

#### **Objection to Claims 5**

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 5 due to an informality in the last line of claim 5. Applicants amended claim 5 as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

#### **Rejection of Claims 1, 6, 8-10, 14-17, 21, 23 and 24**

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 8-10, 14-17, 21, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,789,060 to Wolfe et al. (“Wolfe”). Applicants submit that amended claims 1, 8, 16 and 21 obviate the rejection. Claims 14-16 were amended to better conform with amended claim 8. Claim 22 was amended to better conform to amended claim 21. Claim 24 was amended to correct a typographical error.

Amended claim 1 is directed to a method for processing voicemail messages. The method includes, among other things, receiving at least one selection action from one or more users, the at least one selection action identifying a portion of one or more voicemail message transcripts for delivery to one or more parties identified by the one or more users.

Applicants submit that Wolfe discloses selecting an entire file. Wolfe fails to disclose or suggest at least one selection action identifying a portion of one or more voicemail

message transcripts for delivery to one or more parties identified by the one or more users, as required by claim 1.

Because Wolfe fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1, Applicants submit that amended independent claim 1 and dependent claim 6 are not anticipated by Wolfe and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1 and 6 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 8 is directed to a method that includes, among other things, receiving a selection action identifying a portion of one of the plurality of indexed speech file transcripts, and providing the identified portion of the one of the indexed speech file transcripts to the one or more intended recipients. Applicants submit that Wolfe does not disclose or suggest both of these features.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Wolfe, at col. 7, lines 22-46, discloses a text correction command that would inherently include deletion and hence allegedly discloses a user selecting portions of text, not deleted, for transmission. Applicants disagree with the Examiner's analysis.

The Examiner's above analysis, with respect to the disclosure of Wolfe, amounts to receiving a selection action identifying portions of text for deletion and providing the unidentified portions for transmission. Applicants submit that Wolfe fails to disclose or suggest providing the identified portion of the one of the indexed speech file transcripts to the one or more intended recipients.

Because Wolfe fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of amended claim 8, Applicants submit that claim 8 and dependent claims 9, 10, 14 and 15 are not anticipated by Wolfe and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 8-10, 14 and 15 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 21 is directed to a system for processing voicemail messages. The system includes, among other things, a user selection component to allow a user to select a portion of at least one of the transcripts of the voicemail messages for delivery

to one or more parties. Applicants submit that claim 21 is similar to claims 1 and 8 and submit that claim 21 is not anticipated by Wolfe for reasons similar to those provided with respect to claims 1 and 8. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claim 21 and dependent claims 23 and 24 be withdrawn.

**Rejection of Claims 2, 4, 7, 12, 13 and 20**

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, 7, 12, 13 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wolfe in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,360 to Davidson et al. (“Davidson”). Applicants submit that amended claims 1, 8 and 16 obviate the rejection. Claim 12 was amended to better conform with amended independent claim 8 and claim 20 was amended to better conform with independent claim 16.

Claims 2, 4 and 7 depend from amended claim 1. Applicants submit that claims 2, 4 and 7 are not anticipated by Wolfe for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants submit that Davidson fails to make up for the deficiencies of Wolfe. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 2, 4 and 7 are patentable over Wolfe and Davidson and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2, 4 and 7 be withdrawn.

Claims 12 and 13 depend from amended claim 8. Applicants submit that claims 12 and 13 are not anticipated by Wolfe for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 8. Applicants submit that Davidson fails to make up for the deficiencies of Wolfe. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 12 and 13 are patentable over Wolfe and Davidson and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 12 and 13 be withdrawn.

Claim 20 depends from claim 16, which is not anticipated by Wolfe for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 16. Applicants submit that Davidson fails to make up for the deficiencies of Wolfe. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 20 is

patentable over Wolfe and Davidson and respectfully request that the rejection of claim 20 be withdrawn.

**Rejection of Claims 3, 11, 18 and 22**

On page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 11, 18 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wolfe in view of Applicants' admitted prior art. Applicants submit that amended claims 1, 8, 16 and 21 obviate the rejection. Applicants submit that claims 11 and 22 were amended to better conform with their respective independent claims.

Claims 3, 11, 18 and 22 depend from claims 1, 8, 16 and 21, respectively, which are not anticipated by Wolfe for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 8, 16 and 21. Applicants submit that Applicants' admitted prior art fails to make up for the deficiencies of Wolfe. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 3, 11, 18 and 22 are patentable over Wolfe and Applicants' admitted prior art and respectfully request that the rejection of claim 3, 11, 18 and 22 be withdrawn.

**Rejection of Claims 5 and 19**

On page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wolfe in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,446,041 to Reynar et al. ("Reynar"). Applicants submit that claim 1 obviates the rejection with respect to claim 5. Claim 19 was canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby making the rejection of claim 19 moot. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1, which is not anticipated by Wolfe for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants submit that Reynar fails to make

up for the deficiencies of Wolfe. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 5 is patentable over Wolfe and Reynar and respectfully request that the rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner reasserted his belief that claims 1 and 16 are unpatentable over Wolfe in view of Reynar and indicated that Reynar was relied upon to exhibit that selecting a portion of text for output is commonly known in the art and that selecting a portion of text to transmit is allegedly a logical and obvious extension.

Applicants disagree.

Reynar, at col. 4, lines 39-51, discloses:

Often times, the text may be sufficiently different from the dictation that a user cannot recall what was originally spoken based on the visual prompt of the transcribed document alone. In this event, the user may select a portion of text from the display screen and request that the multi-source input and playback utility play aloud the speech used to generate the selected text. Once the user selects a portion of text for playback, the utility highlights the text selected in order to provide visual feedback for the user. This feedback may alternately consist of displaying the selected text in a different color, causing the text to blink, or otherwise distinguishing the selected text from the rest of the document.

Thus, Reynar discloses that the generated text may be different from the original dictation and that the user may not recall the original dictation. In this situation, the user may select a portion of the displayed text to hear a playback of the speech used to generate the selected text. Therefore, Reynar suggests playback of speech used to generate a selected portion of displayed text to refresh the user's memory with respect to the original spoken message in order for the user to check the accuracy of the transcribed speech.

Wolfe discloses, at col. 2, lines 7-12:

The dictation and associated information are forwarded to a transcription system that converts the information into a document. This document is returned to the originator for review, modification and/or approval. Once approved, the document is routed to the appropriate destination based on the associated routing information.

Thus, Wolfe discloses returning a transcribed document to an originator and once the originator is satisfied with the transcribed document, the document is routed to its destination.

Applicants submit that a combination of Wolfe and Reynar would provide a document dictation and transcription facility that would permit an originator to playback speech that was used to generate a selected portion of transcribed text so that the originator may more easily confirm the accuracy of the transcribed text. Applicants submit that neither Wolfe nor Reynar disclose or suggest providing an identified portion of one or more voicemail message transcripts to one or more parties specified by the one or more users, as required by independent claim 1.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

Having addressed all objections and rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 5, 2006

Correspondence Address:  
Samuel H. Dworketsky  
AT&T Corp.  
Room 2A-207  
One AT&T Way  
Bedminster, NJ 07921

By: Richard C. Irving

Richard C. Irving  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 38,499  
Phone: 410-414-3056  
Fax No.: 410-510-1433